IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF JUNE TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT
HON'BLE SRI DEVINDER GUPTA,
CHIEF JUSTICE
and
THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO : 10115 of 2004

Between:

1 Baggi Narsimha Rao, S/o. Koteshwar Rao,
Occ: Advocate, Practicing at Sattenapally, R/o. Sattendapally, Guntur District,
A.P. (Hall Ticket No. 3780)
2 S.V. L.N.S.R.V. Prasad, S/o. Samba Murthy,
Occ: Asst. Public Prosecutor, 7th A.M.M. Guntur, R/o. Guntur District., A.P., (Hall Ticket No. 4415)

..... PETITIONERS

AND

High Court of A.P., Rep. by its Registrar General, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue any direction or order, writ or writs, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondent in not calling the petitioners for interview for

the post of Junior Civil Judge, as per notification dated 2/2003-RC, as

illegal arbitrary and against the principles of natural justice and consequently direct the respondent to issue call letter to the petitioners to attend interview for the post of Junior Civil Judge, will be held on 12-7-2004 in the interest of Justice and equity.

For the Petitioner : MR CH.JANARDHAN REDDY, Advocate

For the Respondent : MR.C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY
SC FOR APHC.

The Court Made the Following :

1. Petitioner appeared in the written examination for recruitment to the post of Junior Civil Judge/Judicial Magistrate of First Class in the recent examination conducted by the High Court. By this writ petition, they are seeking direction to declare the action of the respondent in not calling them for interview on the allegation that they fared well and their names did not appear in the list of selected candidates to be called for interview. Thus, petitioners wanted this court to issue direction for revaluation of the papers.

2. Such a prayer cannot be allowed on any of the grounds mentioned in the writ petition. May be that petitioners are fully confident that they have answered

questions to their satisfaction. It is not the satisfaction of the petitioners but the satisfaction of the examiner which is the basis for evaluating the question paper. Hence writ petition is

dismissed. Liberty is reserved to the petitioners to submit representation for re-checking of the papers. We make it clear that re-checking means to see whether any question has been un-marked or that there is any error in totaling of the marks awarded. Representation, if filed within a period of two days from today, will be duly considered. No costs.

_____

DEVINDER GUPTA. C.J.,

_____

G. ROHINI. J.,

Dated: 28.06.2004.

Vrk.

To

1. High Court of A.P., Rep. by its Registrar General, Hyderabad.
2. Two CD copies.